

*File*

STATEMENT OF J. EDGAR HOOVER  
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
BEFORE  
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION  
ON CAMPUS UNREST

JULY, 1970

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CAMPUS VIOLENCE</u>	1
College Violence	1
Violence in High Schools	6
Effects of Campus Disruptions	9
<u>ORIGIN OF CURRENT STUDENT EXTREMISM</u>	11
An Outgrowth of the Civil Rights Movement	11
Emergence of New Left	11
Free Speech Movement	13
Exploitation of Vietnam War Issue	14
<u>REVOLUTIONARY INFLUENCES ON THE CAMPUS</u>	16
Students for a Democratic Society	16
Student Mobilization Committee to End The War in Vietnam	19
Socialist Workers Party Activities	20
Communist Party Activities	21
Leading Agitators	22
Black Extremist Influences	23
Foreign Influence	26
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	29
Violence is Not Dissent	29
Extremist Distortions of Dissent	30
Combating Campus Turmoil	31

## CAMPUS VIOLENCE

During the past two years, violence and disorder have escalated to the point where they have become commonplace at the college and secondary school levels.

### College Violence

The 1968-69 school year witnessed a heavy wave of demonstrations and violence. During that year there were more than 850 demonstrations on college campuses, including more than 200 instances of building seizures or sit-ins. More than 4,000 individuals were arrested for their disruptive behavior. Damage to school facilities exceeded \$3 million and 61 instances of arsons or attempted arsons were committed. This wave of destruction left one dead and over 125 injured.

While these figures are shocking, they are paled by comparison with the toll of violence that boiled over our campuses this past school year. An unprecedented number of disturbances and incidents of student-connected violence erupted during the 1969-70 school year. In almost every category measuring unrest and violence, the figures increased sharply over the previous academic year. In 1969-70, there were 1,785 demonstrations on college campuses, including 313 building seizures by rampaging students. Two hundred and forty-six arsons or attempted arsons and 14 instances of bombing attacks were committed. Nearly 7,200 arrests were made in connection



with these incidents, and damages exceeded \$9,500,000. Eight deaths were reported and injuries totaled 462, nearly two-thirds of which were sustained by police and college officials.

Not only have the colleges themselves suffered. The surrounding communities have been severely affected. For instance, William Kunstler, who directed the defense of the now famous Chicago Seven, who were tried for violations of Federal antiriot statutes, spoke to a rally at the University of California at Santa Barbara on February 25. He told his audience that if the President would not listen to the people, then it was each person's duty to be counted in the streets. Following the rally, demonstrators, including college students and other militants, gathered in a park in nearby Isla Vista. They burned the local branch of the Bank of America. It has been estimated that damage to the bank reached \$400,000 and that, in addition, \$29,000 was inflicted in damages to other property.

Following the U.S. troop movement into Cambodia, students at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, left the campus to demonstrate in Madison. They inflicted widespread property damage which has been estimated at \$270,000. In addition, the payment of overtime to police departments and the National Guard to control the situation during these disruptions reportedly cost the taxpayers in excess of \$300,000.



An especially heavy wave of student disorder and violence took place during the two-week period of May 1-15, 1970, immediately following U.S. action against North Vietnamese sanctuaries in Cambodia. During this single two-week period alone, the toll of violence, injuries, and arrests, and the number of demonstrations, was comparable to or greater than what transpired during the entire previous academic year!

Some examples will serve to show the true nature of this rampage.

During the evenings of May 12 and 13, students at Eastern Michigan University defied a curfew that was in effect at the University to roam the campus and vandalize buildings. They littered the streets with nails and broken bottles. Two students were arrested when they attempted to fire-bomb an electric power station serving the campus.

On May 6, 500 students at the State University of New York at Buffalo attacked members of the Buffalo Police Department and other law enforcement officials. Assault groups numbering 50 to 75 employed hit-and-run tactics. They threw bricks and other missiles at the officers, injuring several.

On May 11, students at the University of South Carolina seized the University's Administration Building. A meeting of the University Board of Directors was going on inside. The students inflicted extensive damage to the building, destroyed records of the Treasurer's

Office and severely damaged state vehicles parked in the vicinity. As the students held the first floor of the building, the Directors were not allowed to leave the building. National Guard and police, called to restore order, were assaulted with bricks and other missiles by the students.

A particularly senseless assault took place at the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, on May 19. Fifty to sixty Black Student Union members, angered at the school's refusal to meet their demands to sever scholastic relations with another college and to keep police off campus, stormed into the library and pulled an estimated 25,000 volumes from the shelves. Two library assistants were assaulted.

A substantial percentage of student demonstrations and disorders have, of course, revolved around the issue of U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia and the activities of colleges and universities in support of the U.S. defense program. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) has been a favorite target of student dissidents, particularly where violent tactics have been employed. The ROTC program was the focus of 281 student demonstrations in the recently completed school year and a substantial number of the incidents involving violence, particularly arson, were directed against ROTC facilities.



The tragic events that transpired at Kent State University included an \$80,000 arson of its ROTC building. Our subsequent investigation into these events turned up reports of a professor who discussed in detail the techniques and mechanics of preparing Molotov cocktails with his class. This same professor, following the shooting, exhorted the students to participate in further confrontations with authorities.

On the night of May 5, a group of radicals held a rally at Washington University in St. Louis. Following verbal assaults on the United States by several students and a professor, the group marched to the college Air Force ROTC building. After breaking into the building they removed and used papers and other material to build a bonfire. They used this flaming material to set fire to the building. Firemen called to the scene were assaulted by demonstrators and had to be protected by police in order to fight the blaze.

The range of student demands which have prompted demonstrations and often violence has not, however, been entirely confined to protests against the U.S. effort in Vietnam. Student demonstrators and dissidents have called for the complete overhauling of the American educational system and a restructuring of individual colleges and universities; for the elimination of all recruiting on campus by the Government or American business concerns; for substantial student influence in the hiring and firing of faculty members;



for complete amnesty for students prosecuted or suspended for their roles in campus disturbances; for sexual freedom on campuses; and for a variety of other objectives covering almost every facet of American academic, social, and political life. To a considerable extent, the interests and demands of minority groups have figured prominently in student demonstrations. There have been persistent demands for increases in the number of black faculty members and students; for the establishment of black study centers and academic programs; and for special treatment for minority students, for instance, demands that all black students receive passing grades or qualify for admission to college regardless of any academic standards. Of the 1,785 campus demonstrations which occurred in the 1969-70 school year, some 225 had marked racial overtones.

#### Violence in High Schools

Our secondary schools have not escaped the wave of agitation and violence which has plagued the country in recent years. During the 1969-70 school year just completed, there were more than 500 disorders and disruptions reported in high schools located in 33 different states and the District of Columbia. A great majority of these disorders were racial confrontations between blacks and whites and centered around racially motivated issues. Over 1,800 persons were arrested in connection with these incidents and nearly 600 injuries were reported. In nearly 300 cases, police assistance was required to

restore order and there were many instances of personal assaults, stabbings, and the use of such weapons as knives, guns, bayonets, machetes and chains. To a major extent, these high school disorders were triggered by various manifestations of racial tension. These included black demands for increased educational opportunities or influence in the educational system; black resentment regarding the use of Confederate symbols during school functions; alleged discrimination against blacks in the composition of student organizations; white reaction and countercharges that blacks were receiving privileged treatment; and complaints from both the white and black camps directed at various aspects of desegregation procedures.

Attempts to predict or anticipate the immediate causes of such disorders is virtually impossible. Demands made by student demonstrators have in some cases approached the ridiculous, but have nonetheless triggered serious violence. For instance, one such disorder at Central High School, Battle Creek, Michigan, was reportedly caused by the manner in which ketchup was being dispensed in the school cafeteria. On September 22, 1969, a group of Negro students demanded to meet with school officials to discuss this "issue." Formerly, ketchup had been placed on the lunch tables in squirt-type plastic containers, which the students used to squirt each other. As a result, school authorities replaced the squirt container with small individual ketchup containers. Negro students, in meeting with school officials,



demanded the return of the squirt containers. When the issue was not immediately resolved, about 30 Negro students left the school grounds and marched to downtown Battle Creek. Police assistance was needed to disperse the group and five Negro students were arrested.

On January 23, 1970, a group of 200 students staged a sit-in at Annapolis High School, Annapolis, Maryland. One of the major "issues" was lack of "soul music" on the school's loudspeaker system. Less than three weeks later at the same school, a vice principal told 50 Negro students meeting in the cafeteria to return to class. The students refused and, instead, ran through the school, breaking windows, overturning desks, and ransacking the school's attendance office. The original group of 50 grew to about 200 before order was restored.

On May 13, students at Delhi Tech, Delhi, New York, held a rally to demand that beer be allowed on campus and that the dormitories be open to both sexes. When these demands were not granted, students set fire to several campus buildings and cut fire hoses to prevent firemen from extinguishing a large blaze. Following the fire, students brought beer on the campus and declared open dormitories.



## Effects of Campus Disruptions

The adverse effects of violent campus protest activity on the part of these student revolutionists are many, far reaching, and incalculable. The impersonal statistics concerning property damages, injuries, and arrests tell only a small part of the story.

Campus dissident activities leading to violence have seriously eroded academic freedom by interfering with the orderly processes of education. They have infringed to a major extent upon the rights of other students to secure an education. In many cases, they have seriously delayed or actually prevented the great majority of nonextremist students from completing their courses through the suspension of classes or the closing of schools following violent activity. The demands of student activists for the abolition or weakening of scholastic requirements either for students or for faculty members would, if granted, serve to foster a level of mediocrity in our colleges, universities, and secondary schools.

To a considerable extent, the activities of student dissidents and violence-prone campus radicals has implanted the notion in our youth that the road to progress lies in threats, disruption, and destruction. In many cases, a false sense of achievement by means of illegal tactics has been instilled in the minds of our youth and this, in turn, has led to a willingness to discard rational approaches to the

problems confronting our society. Student extremism has served to undermine respect for authority and for our system of rule by law thereby imperiling not only our educational structure, but even our very system of Government. In numerous cases, radical student activities have diverted funds which could have been used on improving facilities but which had to be spent on repairing extensive physical damage. Such activities have also seriously weakened the confidence of the American public in our colleges and universities and thereby invite a serious loss of financial support for our educational system from private sources as well as from public revenues. They have deprived colleges and universities of substantial funds and skilled personnel by forcing Government research activities off the campus. In many cases, they have robbed students of career opportunities by driving recruiters for both the Government and industry from the campus. They have elevated a small minority of anarchistic students and faculty to positions of power and influence far out of proportion to their size. Equally important, they have raised a clear danger of repressive legislation aimed at controlling campus violence which could threaten the very essence of academic freedom.



## ORIGIN OF CURRENT STUDENT EXTREMISM

### Outgrowth of Civil Rights Movement

Contemporary student extremism had its origin in the widespread student participation in the civil rights movement which swept through the South in the late 1950's. The numerous sit-ins, picketings, vigils, marches, and freedom rides captured the attention and interest of many militant college students, both white and black. The civil rights struggle gradually became an emotional outlet for protest against the entire "system" which was charged with being responsible for all the Nation's shortcomings.

Student activists were strongly influenced by the direct-action and so-called nonviolent resistance tactics employed by various civil rights leaders. Widespread acceptance of the concept of civil disobedience and open hostility toward the police did much to bring about a breakdown of law and order in many areas. This protest activity of the late 1950's and early 1960's clearly provided an ideological springboard for the later development of a nihilistic, anarchistic movement dedicated to the total destruction of the traditions and institutions of our society.

### Emergence of New Left

The New Left as a movement was first evidenced in a periodical called "Studies on the Left" issued in the Fall of 1959 by a group of radical graduate students at the University of Wisconsin.



In 1962, the movement received its greatest impetus and direction. In June of that year, a group of students, including veterans of civil rights demonstrations, met in Port Huron, Michigan, to reorganize the little known Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which was an offshoot of the League for Industrial Democracy, a socialist-oriented group.

In the Fall of 1962, these new leftists began organizing a militant corps of student activists who were indoctrinated in the tactics of direct action which had been so successful in the campaign for civil rights. Emphasis was placed on developing and propagandizing issues which were alleged to be the cause of student discontent. This organizational work, spearheaded by the SDS, continued for the next two years, and during this period, campus protests became a way of life for an ever-growing segment of the academic community -- students as well as professors.

While the main thrust during 1963 and 1964 was directed toward organizing a new radical campus movement, the civil rights movement was not forsaken. In the Summers of 1963 and 1964, hundreds of student activists participated in voter-registration drives sponsored by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Congress of Racial Equality, and other civil rights organizations in various southern states. In some cases, they encountered strong resistance and this experience served to nurture the growing militant philosophy of the New Left.

## Free Speech Movement

By the Fall of 1964, the New Left had developed into a formidable disruptive force on the campus, capable of obstructing the normal operations of some of our largest educational institutions, notably the University of California at Berkeley (UCB). Student radicals, looking for a way to launch a rebellion against authorities at UCB, seized an opportunity in mid-September, 1964. At that time, the Dean of Students sent a letter to the leaders of all student organizations setting forth regulations pertaining to off-campus organizations.

Many students interpreted this as an infringement on their rights. This student reaction constituted a ready-made issue, and student extremists promptly crystallized support around it by forming the so-called Free Speech Movement (FSM). The FSM conducted a series of protests and bitter confrontations which completely disrupted campus life. They were climaxed by a massive sit-in in December, 1964, at the UCB administration building, during which more than 800 demonstrators were arrested. The FSM was hailed by new leftists as a highly successful undertaking, and thereafter "university reform" became one of the major planks of the New Left platform.



## Exploitation of Vietnam War Issue

Encouraged by the "successes" achieved by the FSM, New Left leaders seized upon other issues to broaden their protest operations. The intensification of the Vietnam War, which followed the August, 1964, Gulf of Tonkin incident, provided an ideal platform.

Keenly aware of the developing antiwar issue, the SDS sponsored a Student March on Washington in April, 1965, to protest the war. The turnout for this demonstration was 15,000. Support was received from a variety of organizations ranging from established pacifist groups to organizations which have made no secret of their allegiance to international communism. This demonstration firmly nailed down another plank in the New Left platform--the "antiwar movement."

Since this first major venture, New Left leaders have played a key role in initiating and organizing a long succession of antiwar demonstrations. Student demonstrations throughout the country--led by the New Left--multiplied rapidly, becoming increasingly more militant and violent as opposition to the Vietnam War mounted, and rapidly emerging as the dominant issue of campus extremists.

By the late 1960's, the New Left had become a band of undisguised revolutionaries intent on tearing down established society and provoking all-out chaos. The New Left had also sought to join forces with the black student movement to use black demands as a



rallying point for its own cause. The systematic radicalization practiced and promoted by the New Left, together with black student activity, combined to produce an explosive force on the campus.

Thus, in the brief span of a few years, student agitation and violence--both white and black--has escalated from relatively peaceful sit-ins to outright revolutionary activity. The spark--student power--from the Berkeley campus in 1964 has spread like wildfire to ignite conflagrations on campuses all over the country.

## REVOLUTIONARY INFLUENCES ON THE CAMPUS

The range of subversive elements involved in the disturbances plaguing our schools encompasses virtually the whole spectrum of present-day leftist ideology. New Left activists, old left revolutionaries, black extremists, and outright anarchists have all played a part. Radical-minded students have been aided and abetted by certain faculty members in carrying on their violent onslaught. Old-line leftists, centered off campus, have lost no opportunity to inject themselves into issues affecting student life in an effort to promote their particular brands of rebellion.

### Students for a Democratic Society

The most widely publicized group active in fanning the flames of student discontent and violence has been the notorious Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). This group came into being in 1962. Since that time, it has spread its insidious philosophy on to hundreds of campuses across the Nation and has moved in rapid succession from a policy of protest to one of active resistance and finally, to the urging of open warfare against our system. Embracing the tenets of Marxism-Leninism, its

leaders have publicly stated that, if our academic institutions are not restructured, they must be destroyed. In a manner totally alien to the principles of our democracy, it has sought to achieve its goals.

SDS groups have been in the forefront of student disruptions and violence. Its leaders have blatantly encouraged the use of violent and terrorist tactics. Bernardine Dohrn, prominent SDS leader, has openly urged the SDS to close down American schools, indicating that a few well-placed bombs would serve well in this regard.

In December, 1969, Mark Rudd, another leader of SDS, stated that violence was the path to revolution and that in order to carry on this revolution, it would be necessary to go underground. Following these statements, a group of hard-core SDS activists, self-styled as the Weatherman faction, went into hiding in early 1970. They made no secret of the fact that they were ready to launch a campaign of terrorism throughout the United States. Shortly following this, on March 6, 1970, a series of explosions demolished a New York City residence. It was subsequently learned the building had been serving as



a "bomb factory." Three leading SDS figures were killed in this explosion.

The following examples of SDS participation in campus disorders are indicative of the extent to which followers of this organization have promoted or encouraged disruption.

On November 13, 1969, a group of students at Fordham University, Bronx, New York, known as the Committee to Abolish ROTC but in actuality led by SDS members, occupied the south wing of the Administration Building. In attempts to end this demonstration, 14 campus security guards were injured and six demonstrators were arrested. Damage to this building during the demonstration was estimated at \$10,000.

SDS members were among the primary planners and supporters of a demonstration at Columbia University on March 13, 1970, which culminated in a sit-in during which several of the campus buildings were vandalized. Damage was estimated at \$10,000. The purpose of this demonstration was to force Columbia University to furnish bail funds for 21 members of the Black Panther Party who had been jailed in New York. Participants in this demonstration were encouraged to bring cans of black and red paint to spray slogans on campus buildings.

On February 25, 1970, SDS members at the State University of New York at Buffalo went on a rampage after learning that a basketball game between their university and another college had been canceled to forestall possible disruptions. They entered the University's Student Union Building destroying windows and furniture. Police officers responding to the disorder were the victims of thrown rocks and broken glass. Four campus policemen were treated for injuries. Damage to the building was estimated at \$5,000.

Student Mobilization Committee  
to End The War in Vietnam (SMC)

The SMC grew out of the National Students Strike for Peace (NSSP) conference at Chicago, Illinois, in December, 1966, whose organizers included the Communist Party, USA, the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP), and their respective youth groups--W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America and the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA). In 1968, the Communist Party elements withdrew from the SMC, leaving the SWP and YSA in control. The SMC, both locally and nationally, is now firmly dominated by the SWP and the YSA.

The SMC claims to have chapters on over 1,000 college campuses throughout the country, and its national membership has

been reported to be as high as 20,000 by leaders of the organization. Its chief aim is to involve as many individuals as possible in antiwar demonstrations.

An SMC conference held in June, 1970, emphasized that peaceful and disciplined demonstrations are a must if the antiwar movement is to accomplish its purpose. At the same time, the very nature of the protests set the stage for civil disobedience and police confrontation by irresponsible dissident elements.

#### Socialist Workers Party Activities

One old line Marxist organization which has collected clear dividends from the upsurge of radicalism on American college campuses is the Socialist Workers Party (SWP). The SWP, which models its theories on the ideas of Leon Trotsky, one of the authors of the Bolshevik Revolution, has never sought a large membership but it has exercised influence beyond its numbers through various front groups. The most important SWP front group and its main source of new members is the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) which concentrates its efforts on the American college campuses under the strict control of the parent SWP and with complete allegiance to the militant Trotskyite theory.

The advent of the New Left and the surge of radicalism among American students has greatly boosted the Trotskyite cause.



Membership in the YSA has increased from a mere 200 members in the mid 1960's to more than 1,000 today. Through the YSA, moreover, the Trotskyite movement is in firm control of one of the major antiwar groups in this country, the SMC, which numbers additional thousands of college and high school youths in its ranks. Every prominent officer of this Committee is a member of either the YSA or its parent group the SWP. Thus, one of the leading and most active student antiwar groups in this country is little more than a puppet of an organization which patterns its philosophy and its tactics after one of the architects of the Bolshevik Revolution.

#### Communist Party Activities

The Communist Party, USA, has not had as much success, as it would like in wielding influence among campus dissidents. The Party has not directly instigated or fomented student violence although individual members have taken part in campus disorders on occasion. Nevertheless, the Communist Party is well aware of the opportunities to enhance its influence presented by the current seige of student disorders. Party publications such as the "Daily World" and the "People's World" regularly portray student militants in a highly sympathetic light. Communist Party leaders lose no opportunity to make appearances on our college campuses and during the past academic year, 1969-70, Party leaders made some 28 such visits. Communist Party

members have also been active in various student antiwar groups and a member of the Communist Party National Committee (Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil) played a key role in organizing the Free Speech Movement at the University of California in the mid-1960's.

### Leading Agitators

The roster of self-proclaimed and undisguised revolutionaries and extremists who have played a significant role in fomenting student violence is too long to explore fully here. However, prominent among these individuals have been Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman and David Dellinger.

Rubin, one of the best known of the so-called "Yippies" and well known for his unruly performances before Congressional committees and his advocacy of drugs, has appeared as a speaker on numerous occasions before student groups in various parts of the country. Hoffman, another "Yippie" leader who openly advocates the overthrow of the U.S. Government and who describes himself as a "hard-core anarchist," has likewise appeared on a number of occasions before college audiences and has become a favorite of student radicals throughout the country. Dellinger, a leader of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam and a perennial speaker at major antiwar demonstrations, has likewise been a regular visitor to our college campuses. Dellinger has openly expressed his sympathy for a communist-type society.



All three of these individuals were among the so-called "Chicago 7" who were recently convicted for violations of the Federal antiriot law statutes in connection with the violent demonstration which occurred at the Democratic National Convention in 1968. Dellinger has been especially prominent in making contact with hostile foreign elements including visits to Cuba, Czechoslovakia, North Vietnam, and the Soviet Union. Contacts between leaders of the radical American student and antiwar movements and representatives from these communist countries and others have not been infrequent.

#### Black Extremist Influences

Racial extremists, recognizing the potential for revolutionary action among impressionable students, have eagerly sought to exploit school disorders. Many make no effort to conceal their aims. Eldridge Cleaver, Minister of Information of the violence-prone Black Panther Party (BPP), has declared that the aim of the BPP is not to reform the curriculum at a given college or have a Black Student Union recognized at a given high school, but simply "to destroy the present structure of power in the United States ... to overthrow the government." In 1969 the Panthers attempted to organize black student unions on many college and high school campuses to voice the demands of black students. In January, 1969, two armed BPP members



were shot and killed by a rival black extremist group as they left a conference at the University of California in Los Angeles where they attempted to further BPP efforts to gain control of black student unions in the area.

The Panthers in late 1969 turned their emphasis to the organization of black high school students. Cleaver has asserted that black high school students find it easier to relate to revolutionary ideas than do black college students. This redirection on the part of the BPP has resulted in a marked increase in appearances at high schools by Panthers who still continue to spread their revolutionary doctrines on college campuses. BPP films, including one which by its title calls for the killing of police, are used by the BPP at high schools as well as on college campuses.

"The Black Panther" newspaper, with its advocacy of violence and revolution, has been distributed at high schools. Such polarization of black students by extremists is, of course, seriously undermining efforts to achieve integrated education.

As one high school principal in a large eastern city said, "What can you do when you have 1,000 blacks in your school, all programmed for special behavior and violence?"

The importance which the BPP attaches to propagandizing black college students is exemplified by the

Black Student Revolutionary Conference held at Yale University, May 16-19, 1970, and attended by some 350 black students. Conference activities were directed by BPP leaders and all whites were excluded. Various speakers recommended that students go to their college libraries and learn all they could concerning guns and bombs. One BPP leader urged arming the black community and a rewriting of the Constitution.

A Black Student Union National Conference was recently held at Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, on May 1-3, 1970. About 350 to 400 attended. The need was stressed for unity among all black organizations to succeed in a world revolution.

Other black extremists have also been successful in the organization of student groups. James Garrett, a former member of both the extremist Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the BPP, was the driving force behind the organization of a Black Student Union at San Francisco State College which triggered violence at that school in 1968.

Involved in black student unrest is a determined ruthless minority of black students--revolutionaries, radicals, anarchists, racists, zealots, and malcontents--who are not interested in reasoned discussion, intellectual honesty, established democratic processes



or constructive reform of the educational process. Their objectives are destruction, domination and power. This campus unrest reflects the happenings in the entire community and is closely related to it. As long as extremism is involved in the racial situation, all areas of the black community, including students, will continue to be affected.

### Foreign Influence

Not only have student radicals been supported by off-campus domestic subversives, but they have been exhorted to action by professional agitators from abroad. The following instances will show the keen interest of foreign radicals in our academic turmoil.

In the Fall of 1968, Ernest and Gisela Mandel of Brussels, Belgium, spent two months in the United States on a speaking tour of college campuses. Ernest Mandel, a German-born revolutionist, is a leading member of the Trotskyite United Secretariat of the Fourth International, headquartered in Paris, France. The Mandels spoke at over 50 colleges and universities during their stay in this country.

In his first speech given at Rutgers University in September, 1968, Mandel told his audience that scholars must educate students for their role in the coming revolution. Students, he said, are the "detonators" in the formula for triggering a social explosion creating a revolutionary situation. At the University of Pennsylvania, he asserted that students should organize in force



because the time is ripe for overthrowing the capitalist system and bringing about a change within the framework of Marxist-Leninist theory.

During the period from September 25 to March 12, 1969, Karl Dietrich Wolff, a professed Marxist and an official of the Socialist Students Federation, a militant leftist-oriented student organization in West Germany, appeared at some 13 colleges and universities in this country on a fund-raising tour. Wolff told his listeners at the University of Michigan that there is a need to build an international revolutionary alliance since a victory for the movement in one country is a victory in another. He criticized students in the United States for not working together as they do in Germany. He said that the time was past for just sitting around discussing matters, that they should act.

In addition to these traveling emissaries of subversion and violence, student dissidents here have consistently received the active support and encouragement of hostile foreign governments. For instance, between December, 1969, and February, 1970, more than 1,000 American new leftists, principally students, traveled to Cuba by invitation for the announced purpose of helping the Castro regime harvest sugar cane. This group, which became known as the "Venceremos Brigade," was actively supported by such extremist groups as SDS and the Black Panther Party. While the ostensible

purpose of this effort was to harvest a sugar cane crop, it is obvious that the project afforded a unique opportunity for the Castro regime to indoctrinate and train revolutionary followers in this country. In fact, it was the stated objective of the organizers of the Brigade to strive to develop a serious and disciplined revolutionary cadre which could gain a practical understanding of the creative application of communist principles. Significantly, two of the most active recruiters for the Brigade were Ted Gold and Diana Oughton, both members of the notorious Weatherman group who were killed in the March 6 explosions at New York City.

## CONCLUSION

### Violence is Not Dissent

Dissent in the form of lawful demonstrations and legitimate protest are commendable and necessary in a democracy. But violence, destruction and terrorism cannot be equated with legitimate dissent. The American people have long since passed the point of calling a halt to mob violence, to carnage and destruction on our college campuses, and to the willful disruption of our entire educational system. An end must be brought to the whole catalogue of extremist-inspired disorders in our schools. As Americans, whatever our individual political preference or persuasion may be, we must reaffirm a solid commitment to our form of government, to our Constitution, and to our educational institutions.

The flood of violence which has engulfed our campuses, often deliberately promoted by extremist forces, has imperiled the inherent right of the vast majority of students to obtain an education uninterrupted by disorder and turmoil. Peaceful members of the academic community have been confronted by sit-ins, seizures of campus buildings, destruction of university property, forcible detention of teachers, and an array of other forms of terror and blackmail. Such activity can in no way be termed legitimate dissent.



## Extremist Distortion of Dissent

Extremism in the United States during the past decade began with civil disobedience, which was soon transformed into resistance to authority, and eventually to violence and lawlessness. Rationalizations for violence by college professors and administrators have encouraged lawlessness and destruction on the campus. Members of the academic community who defend or condone wanton acts of violence and riotous conduct do obvious harm to our country and its people. They tacitly excuse extremism. By minimizing the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship and making light of its privileges and opportunities, they help to undermine our Nation's confidence, morale, patriotism, and unity.

The anarchistic Students for a Democratic Society, which has a following of students and faculty members on a great many of the Nation's campuses, has loudly advertised its belief in violence and, if need be, total revolution to achieve its objectives. The leadership of this organization has openly advocated the use of sabotage and explosives and other weapons against police and authorities and has urged outright rebellion and overthrow of the "establishment."

Against this background, it is little wonder that followers of this notorious group have played a leading role in the chaos and destruction which has raged on our college campuses during the past several years.

## Combating Campus Turmoil

Notwithstanding the fact that the New Left movement is essentially a youth movement made up of irresponsible student activists and an assortment of misguided faculty members and administrators, the American people as a whole must shoulder the responsibility for allowing the situation on our college campuses to degenerate to the tragic conditions now existing in many areas.

Far too many Americans have abdicated a basic responsibility by adopting a philosophy of indulgence and relaxed discipline and retreating from firm moral standards during the difficult process of preparing their children for a place in society. The arrogance which has manifested itself on our college campuses during the past few years is the product of years of permissiveness and capitulation to youth.

This is not to suggest in the least that the great majority of the present generation of youth should be written off. Most of our youth are a credit to their parents and to this country. But a minority, steeped in an attitude of indulgence and materialism, has terrorized whole academic communities, bringing the Nation's educational facilities to the brink of chaos. Arrogant, spoiled youth, many not emotionally mature enough to enter an institution of higher learning, are ill prepared to dictate the academic standards or policies of a college or university, and yet many have done just that.



The strategy against student violence must be to combine firmness with forbearance, strength with understanding. Colleges and universities must reexamine and revise their policies and goals and inaugurate reforms where warranted. Educational institutions should accommodate to these demands that are just and relevant to students.

But it should be obvious by now that good faith and reform will not satisfy or appease student extremists who are bent on disruption and destruction. Therefore, it is imperative that colleges and universities resist and reject all threats of confrontation and violence. If our schools temporize or capitulate to every capricious demand in the vain hope of avoiding trouble, they will inevitably lose their effectiveness as institutions of learning. It would be a social catastrophe and an abdication of moral responsibility if those in authority fail to make a determined effort to contain disruption and violence by a resolute stand.

When acts of violence are perpetrated on academic premises, they should be dealt with by the police in precisely the same manner as these same crimes are dealt with outside the confines of the academic community. Students and professors should be no more privileged in the eyes of the law than any other group of persons. We certainly should never permit the development in this country of any elite group which considers itself a class apart from the laws of our society.



American educators must boldly meet the challenge of student extremism--otherwise, little by little, the principles of academic freedom will be lost to the detriment of all of us. The never-ending struggle to preserve democracy and to inspire succeeding generations of American youth with our heritage of freedom is deeply rooted in our educational institutions. There has never been a greater need for urgency in overcoming the extremist forces which now threaten to destroy these cherished values.